

REMARKS

In the above-mentioned Office Action, claims 142-148, 152, 154-175 and 177-182 were rejected as unpatentable over Klein (U.S. 5,198,275) in view of Popat, et al. (U.S. 5,407,718), claims 149-151 and 183 were rejected over Klein in view of Popat, et al. and further in view of Cahill, et al. (U.S. 5,766,398), claim 153 was rejected as unpatentable over Klein in view of Popat et al. and further in view of Mallya et al. (U.S. 5,656,705), claims 43-56, 65-96 and 184-204 were allowed and claim 176 was objected to. In response thereto, claim 146 has been amended and new claims 205-223 have been added.

The allowance of claims 43-56, 65-96 and 184-204 is acknowledged with appreciation, and they remain in the application.

Objected-to dependent claim 176 has been rewritten as new independent claim 206, and thus is in condition for allowance.

New independent claim 215 includes a cardstock waste frame matrix which is not disclosed by Klein.

The rejections of claims 142-175 and 177-183 as based in whole or in part as being unpatentable over Klein in view of Popat, et al. are respectfully traversed.

In her rejections the examiner stated that the adhesive 95 of Klein was an "ultraremovable adhesive" as claimed herein. This is not correct, Applicants respectfully submit. Referring to the paragraph bridging pages 8 and 9 of the subject specification, an ultraremovable adhesive does not stick to anything permanently. "Generally, adhesions of 'ultraremovable' adhesives at their highest adhesion levels (to a surface such as stainless steel) are roughly half of what they are for conventional 'removable' adhesives.) A fundamental difference is that conventional adhesives provide complete contact with a substrate while ultraremovable [adhesives] provide partial contact. This limited contact area is what prevents an ultraremovable adhesive from becoming permanent, over time." And referring to page 21, "[t]he ultraremovable adhesive 848 can be the Fasson water-base acrylic suspension polymer (made per U.S. Patent 5,656,705) or the CleanTac II adhesive available from Moore." Thus, the ultraremovable adhesive as disclosed and claimed "allows the business cards to be removed from the carrier after the printing operation into individual printed business cards."

In contrast, adhesive 95 of Klein is not an ultraremovable adhesive but rather it is a “contact adhesive.” According to Klein (Col. 3, lines 40-43), the edge margins 130 of the backing sheet 90 are to remain tightly bonded to the corresponding edge margins 110 of the face sheet 85. Specifically adhesive 95 does not function as an ultraremovable adhesive because when it is desired to separate two layers/sheets on opposite sides thereof a release layer is required. That is, to permit the lift out panel 105 to be lifted out (see FIG. 5) a release agent 125 is used (see FIGS. 5 and 6).

Also, when the lift out panel 105 is lifted out, the contact adhesive 95 on its back side remains intact so that the lift out panel can be adhered to another surface. (See Col. 3, lines 28-32.) The lift out panel thus is essentially an adhesive label and not a business card.

In her rejections, the examiner also stated that it would have been obvious to modify the liner 90 of Klein by eliminating the cut [micro-perforation] lines 300. Applicants respectfully disagree. The micro-perforation lines 300 coincident with the score cut lines 200, are a key feature of Klein. See independent claims 1 and 8. Without the micro-perforation lines, the backing sheet would tear unevenly when the cards 80 are separated from the sheet. The rough torn edges would produce unsatisfactory business cards. It is thus respectfully contended that the Examiner’s proposed modification of the Klein card sheet is an improper Section 103 rejection. The Examiner’s attention is directed to MPEP 2143.01 where it is stated that “[i]f [the] proposed modification would render the prior art invention being modified unsatisfactory for its intended purpose, then there is no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification.”


CONCLUDING REMARKS

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the claims as now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended and in view of the remarks above, are respectfully requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the present application to be other than in condition for allowance, she is respectfully requested to telephone Applicants’ undersigned counsel at (213) 689-5142 to discuss the steps necessary to place the application in allowable condition.

If any additional fees are due with this Amendment, the Commissioner is authorized to charge them to Deposit Account Number 07-1853. Should such additional fees be associated with an extension of time, applicant respectfully requests that this paper be considered a petition therefor. A duplicate of this paper is enclosed for the Deposit Account, should it be needed.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas N. Larson
Reg. No. 29,401

Date: November 25, 2003

SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY L.L.P.
801 S. Figueroa, 14th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90017
Telephone: 213-689-5142
Facsimile: 213-623-4581